



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/707,225	11/06/2000	Ralph Victor Bain		8358

27234 7590 10/13/2004

RALPH V. BAIN
39908 SAN SIMEON COURT
FREMONT, CA 94539-3619

EXAMINER

PARTHASARATHY, PRAMILA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2136

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/707,225

Applicant(s)

BAIN, RALPH VICTOR

Examiner

Pramila Parthasarathy

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06/18/2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to request for reconsideration filed on June 18, 2004. Original application contained Claims 1 – 9. Applicant has amended Claims 1 – 3 and 5 – 9. Claim 4 was canceled. Therefore, presently pending claims are 1 – 3 and 5 – 9.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1 and 5 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 1 is missing a period at the end of the claim. Replace “cryptogram,” with “cryptogram.”

Claim 5 will be incomplete with a period at the end of line 2 of the claim. Remove the period at the end of the 2nd line.

Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on June 16, 2004, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

Regarding currently amended Claim 1, the applicant argues that the cited prior arts (CPAs) [Chang et al. U.S. Patent Number 6,105,012, hereinafter “Chang” and

Lincke et al. U.S. Patent Number 6,253,326, hereinafter "Lincke") do not disclose, "a published Website page which contains encrypted content specifically does not use a browser's decryption services". This argument is not found persuasive. Chang teaches and describes a method for providing a secure communication mechanism wherein the website page which contains encrypted content decrypted and viewed by the authorized user without using a browser's decryption service (Chang Column 9 lines 5 – 51 and Lincke Column 13 line 56 – Column 14 line 12).

Regarding currently amended Claim 2, the applicant argues that the CPAs do not disclose, "a decryption function within a web site page that makes available a plurality of said decrypted versions ". This argument is not found persuasive. Chang teaches and describes a method for providing a secure communication mechanism wherein a decryption function within a web site page that makes available a plurality of said decrypted versions (Chang Column 8 lines 7 – 20).

Regarding currently amended Claim 3, the applicant argues that the CPAs do not disclose, "a decryption function could decrypt a cryptogram of any size up to the size allowed by HTML standards for the body of said web site page". This argument is not found persuasive. Chang teaches and describes a method for providing a secure communication mechanism wherein the web page decrypts any document encrypted with confidential information (Chang Column 2 lines 56 – 61 and Column 9 lines 5 – 51).

Regarding currently amended Claim 5, the applicant argues that the CPAs do not disclose, "a decryption function could obtain said associated key from a plurality of said associated keys". This argument is not found persuasive. Chang teaches and describes a method for providing a secure communication mechanism wherein the web page uses more than one key to decrypt the encrypted document, for example, session keys and public keys (Chang Column 2 lines 20 –33 and Column 9 lines 26 – 53).

Regarding currently amended Claims 6 and 8, the applicant argues that the CPAs do not disclose, "a plurality of said associated keys are entered directly into said web site page" and "a plurality of said associated keys are made available to said plurality of said web site pages". These arguments are not found persuasive. Chang teaches and describes a method for providing a secure communication mechanism wherein through the registration process the user appends public keys and the decryption function uses a plurality of associated keys, for example, public key, private key that is provided by the user digitally signing a transaction to be available to plurality of web site pages (Column 2 line 20 – Column 3 line 4).

Regarding currently amended Claim 7, the applicant argues that the CPAs do not disclose, "a human operator receives a validity report directly from said encryption function". This argument is not found persuasive. Chang teaches and describes a method for providing a secure communication mechanism wherein the verification

report is established by verifying digital signature through user registration web page form (Column 2 lines 62 – 66 and Column 11 line 59 – Column 12 line 31).

Regarding currently amended Claim 9, the applicant argues that the CPAs do not disclose, "a decryption function operates only on the first instance of said cryptogram being found within said web site". This argument is not found persuasive. Chang teaches and describes a method for providing a secure communication mechanism wherein the decryption function operates only the first instance of encrypted document for the authorized user to view the decrypted document (Column 2 line 56 – Column 3 line 4; Column 7 lines 18 – 45 and Column 8 line 60 – Column 9 line 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1- 3 and 5 – 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chang et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,105,012).

Regarding Claim 1, Chang teaches and describes a method for automatically operating a decryption function within a web site page (Fig. 1 – 3, 12A – 15B; Summary and Column 1 line 56 – Column 11 line 48), comprising:

- (a) providing said web site page (Column 1 line 56 – Column 2 line 9 and Column 3 line 66 – Column 4 line 11)
- (b) providing a cryptogram within said web site page (Column 4 lines 2 – 20),
- (c) providing the data within said web site page for validating an associated key for said cryptogram (Column 4 lines 2 – 20),
- (d) providing said decryption function within said web site page which will:
 - (1) automatically activate as said web site page is being displayed (Column 3 line 66 – Column 4 line 11),
 - (2) execute within the confines of said web site page (Column 4 lines 2 – 20),
 - (3) receive and validate said associated key (Column 2 lines 62 – 66 and Column 8 lines 60 – 66), and
 - (4) make available a decrypted version of said cryptogram (Column 8 lines 39 – 51).

Claim 2 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Chang teaches and describes a method for automatically operating a decryption function within a web site page (Fig. 1 – 3, 12A – 15B; Summary and Column 1 line 56 – Column 11 line 48), wherein said decryption function makes available a plurality of said decrypted versions in a plurality of said web site pages in a web site, whereby all said decrypted

versions are available for display in the original position of their corresponding said cryptograms within said web site (Column 2 lines 56 – 61; Column 8 lines 7 – 20 and Column 11 lines 16 – 54).

Claim 3 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Chang teaches and describes a method for automatically operating a decryption function within a web site page (Fig. 1 – 3, 12A – 15B; Summary and Column 1 line 56 – Column 11 line 48), wherein said cryptogram is of any size up to the size allowed by HTML standards for the body of said web site page (Column 2 lines 56 – 61 and Column 9 lines 5 – 51).

Claim 5 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Chang teaches and describes a method for automatically operating a decryption function within a web site page (Fig. 1 – 3, 12A – 15B; Summary and Column 1 line 56 – Column 11 line 48), wherein said decryption function obtains said associated key from a plurality of said associated keys whereby each of said plurality of said web site pages contains within itself the means for independently decrypting a plurality of said cryptograms (Chang Column 2 lines 20 – 33 and Column 9 lines 26 – 53).

Claim 6 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 5. Furthermore, Chang teaches and describes a method for automatically operating a decryption function within a web site page (Fig. 1 – 3, 12A – 15B; Summary and Column 1 line 56 – Column 11

line 48), wherein a human operator provides said plurality of said associated keys, comprising:

(a) providing a first means for sending an input request to said human operator (Column 5 lines 43 - 44), and

(b) providing a second means for receiving said plurality of said associated keys directly into said web site page (Column 5 lines 23 - 30),

whereby said human operator determines which of said plurality of said cryptograms are decrypted (Column 5 lines 23 - 45 and Column 6 lines 57 - 64) .

Claim 7 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 6. Furthermore, Chang teaches and describes a method for automatically operating a decryption function within a web site page (Fig. 1 - 3, 12A - 15B; Summary and Column 1 line 56 - Column 11 line 48), wherein said human operator receives a validity report directly from said decryption function upon entry of each said associated key, whereby said human operator is afforded the convenience of receiving notice of the validity of each said associated key from said web site page itself (Column 11 lines 60 - Column 12 line 10).

Claim 8 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 6. Furthermore, Chang teaches and describes a method for automatically operating a decryption function within a web site page (Fig. 1 - 3, 12A - 15B; Summary and Column 1 line 56 - Column 11 line 48), wherein said plurality of associated keys are made available to said plurality of said web site pages in said web site, comprising:

(a) providing a frameset page which will establish communication between said plurality of said web site pages if not already established (Column 1 lines 66 – Column 2 line 10), and

(b) providing a third means which will distribute said plurality of said associated keys to all said web site pages as they are displayed (Column 1 lines 46 – 50; Column 2 lines 30 – 55; Column 8 lines 40 – 46 and Column 11 lines 60 – Column 12 line 10),

whereby said human operator is afforded the convenience of entering said plurality of said associated keys in a single declaration (Column 2 lines 30 – 55; Column 5 lines 23 – 45 and Column 6 lines 57 – 64).

Claim 9 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 6. Furthermore, Chang teaches and describes a method for automatically operating a decryption function within a web site page (Fig. 1 – 3, 12A – 15B; Summary and Column 1 line 56 – Column 11 line 48), wherein said decryption function operates only on the first instance of said cryptogram being found within said web site, whereby said human is requested to enter said plurality of said associated keys only if an instance of said web site page is encountered while said human operator is browsing said web site (Column 2 lines 56 – 66 and Column 8 line 60 – Column 9 line 3).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 or
faxed to: (703) 872-9306 for all formal communications.


Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pramila Parthasarathy whose telephone number is 703-305-8912. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00a.m. To 5:00p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Pramila Parthasarathy
Patent Examiner
703-305-8912
October 1, 2004.


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100